

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


In re Application of:

Mats LEIJON et al.

Serial No.: 08/952,996

Filed: April 10, 1998

A TURBO-GENERATOR PLANT)



PATENT

Group: 2834

Examiner: E. Enad

#75
JL
4/13/00

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Washington, D.C.
April 5, 2000

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of November 5, 1999, the following remarks are presented:

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action of November 5, 1999, wherein the Examiner rejected certain claims over Fig. 3 in the specification, in view of Elton '165, and further in view of Breitenbach or Lauw. The Examiner has rejected certain claims over Takaoka, in view of Elton '165.

In a Response to the prior Office Action, the Applicants argued that Elton fails to suggest or teach the use of the cable dynamo electric machine. Applicants are aware of the Abstract in Elton '165. However, notwithstanding the Examiner's assertion, Elton does not teach or suggest that the cable disclosed in Elton '165 could be the winding of the machine.

Elton does not teach that a power cable for transmission and distribution of electricity could be the winding of a machine. The Abstract in Elton says "The insulated conductor may be windings of a dynamoelectric machine." The